WHAT IS THE FORCE BETWEEN ELECTRONS?

J. Sucher

Center for Theoretical Physics and Department of Physics University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

arXiv:hep-ph/9706219v1 2 Jun 1997

Abstract

The concept of the potential acting between charged particles is reviewed within the framework of quantum electrodynamics. The one-photon and two-photon exchange potentials $V_1\gamma$ and $V_2\gamma$ are discussed, with attention to the following features: the dependence of $V_2\gamma$ on the choice of $V_1\gamma$, the distinction between FGI (Feynman gauge inspired) and CGI (Coulomb gauge inspired) potentials, and the dependence of the large-r behavior on these choices. A summary of available results for two spin-0 particles, for a spin-0 and a spin 1/2 particle and for two spin-1/2 particles is given. The application of such "scattering potentials" to the calculation of energy levels of bound states is discussed.

Contents

I. Introduction and historical review
II. Scattering potentials: One-photon exchange
A. Two spin-1/2 particles
B. Two spin-0 particles
C. A spin-1/2 and a spin-0 particle
D. Remarks on the orbit-orbit interaction
III. Scattering potentials: Two-photon exchange
A. Two spin-0 particles
B. A spin-1/2 and a spin-0 particle
C. Two spin-1/2 particles
IV. Scattering potentials and bound states

1 Introduction and historical review

It is a great pleasure for me to be able to contribute to this volume in honor of my good friend, Ingvar Lindgren. A large part of Ingvar's illustrious career has been devoted to work in theoretical atomic physics. Since the structure and properties of atoms are largely determined by the nature of the interaction between its electrons, I thought this would be a nice occasion to present a discussion of this topic. I will focus on aspects which are of especial importance for the relativistic theory of atomic structure, to which Ingvar has made so many contributions. Because he has had an amazingly large number of graduate students (over 60!), there is a good chance that some of them

will find something here which Ingvar would think they ought to know. (Note: The exclamation point after 60 indicates astonishment, not "factorial" - even Ingvar has his limitations.)

The question posed in the title may be short, but it does not have a snappy answer. If one asks "What is the force between planets?", everybody knows that it is given with great accuracy by Newton's law of universal gravitation. But for electrons, the story is much more complicated and indeed the question itself must be recast. There are at least three reasons for this: (i) physical systems involving electrons must be described by quantum mechanics (QM), (ii) in many such systems, the relative velocities are either not very small compared to c and/or high accuracy is of interest, so special relativity must be used, and (iii) electrons have spin.

With regard to (i), of course in nonrelativistic classical mechanics the concept of force and, in particular, the concept of the force between particles is well-defined; if the force is conservative, so is the concept of two-body potential U(1,2). Thus, in this context the answer is the familiar one. The force is the Coulomb force, known for 200 years, and for two point particles, "1" and "2", the associated potential is just the Coulomb potential $U_C(1,2)$,

$$U_C(1,2) = k_{12}/r, \qquad [k_{12} \equiv e_1 e_2/4\pi] \tag{1}$$

with $r = |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|$; for two electrons, $k_{12} \to \alpha \equiv e^2/4\pi \approx 1/137$. However, in quantum theory the concept of force plays a secondary role and the question should really be: "What is the potential acting between two electrons?" In the context of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics (NRQM) and a configuration space description of the system in question, the answer is again $U_C(1,2)$, now reinterpreted as a multiplicative operator acting on a many-body Schrodinger wave function.

With regard to (ii), when the effects of the finite speed of propagation of light are taken into account, things get more complicated, both on conceptual and technical grounds. Now even in classical electrodynamics the question becomes murky: While the meaning of the force on "1" is sharp, via the Lorentz force law, the force exerted by "2" on "1" depends on the previous history of "2" (and *vice versa*). The question arises: To what extent can one describe the force between "1" and "2" in terms of properties of their motion at a given instant? This question appears to have been first addressed by C.E. Darwin [1], the grandson of Charles Darwin. Darwin showed that, to order v^2/c^2, the effects of retardation can be taken into account by adding to the free Lagrangian for two point particles not only the Coulomb term -U_C but also a term -U_D, with

$$U_D = -1/2(\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) \mathrm{U_C/c^2}, \tag{2}$$

from which the corresponding force may be calculated. On passing to the Hamiltonian formalism and introducing canonical momenta one gets a momentum-dependent interaction term of the form

$$U_D = -1/2(\mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \mathbf{p}_2 + \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \mathbf{p}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) \mathrm{U_C/m_1 m_2 c^2}. \tag{3}$$

This must have a counterpart in quantum theory. But how is one to order the factors, if $\mathbf{p}_\mathrm{i}$ is replaced by $\mathbf{p}_\mathrm{i}^{\mathrm{op}}$? In whatever way this question is answered, it becomes clear that at this level any effective potential between electrons will not be strictly local.

Finally, with regard to (iii), after the discovery of the spin-1/2 character of the electron and the associated magnetic moment, it was obvious that spin-dependent terms must be added to U_D, corresponding to the interaction of the magnetic field produced by "1" with the magnetic moment of "2" and *vice versa* . This led to the now familiar spin-other-orbit and spin-spin potentials and

gave rise to an operator $U_{fs}^{(2)}$ which could describe the effect of electron-electron interaction on atomic fine structure correctly to order $\alpha^2 Ry$ (apart from a missing contact term). So one could say with some justification that, to order e^2 and v^2/c^2, the operator $U_C + U_{fs}^{(2)}$ describes the force between electrons.

After the development of the Dirac equation one might have guessed that, within a framework in which the state of a many-electron system is described by a multi-Dirac spinor, the velocity factors $\mathbf{v}_\mathrm{i}$ in (2) should simply be replaced by their formal counterparts in Dirac theory, *viz* . $c\alpha_\mathrm{i}$. This yields the operator

$$U_B(1,2) = -1/2(\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2 + \alpha_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} \alpha_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})\mathrm{U_C}, \tag{4}$$

known as the Breit operator. It was first obtained by Breit [2], but not in the way I have described. After the development of QED by Dirac, Breit studied the level shift in the helium atom arising from the exchange of a transverse photon between the two electrons, within a formally relativistic (but actually unsound) framework. He concluded that, to a good approximation, this shift is given by the expectation value of U_B with a Dirac-type wave function which includes the effect of U_C. From this one would expect that an effective interaction between electrons which takes into account items (i), (ii), and (iii) is given by the Coulomb-Breit potential,

$$U_{CB}(1,2) = U_C(1,2) + U_B(1,2). \tag{5}$$

However, although accepted for many years, this expectation turns out to be misleading at best and wrong at worst.

In the following sections I will consider the question of the electron-electron interaction from the perspective of modern QED. It will be useful to consider both spin-1/2 and spin-0 particles. Sec. II deals with the relatively simple case of one-photon exchange potentials, in the context of the scattering of two point particles. However, 200 years after Coulomb one ought to have some idea about the extent to which the exchange of two photons can also be represented by an effective potential. This is discussed Sec. III. In Sec. IV I turn to the question of the connection between these potentials and the properties of bound states.

2 Scattering potentials: One-photon-exchange

Within the framework of perturbative quantum field theory, there is a sharp contrast between the beautiful methods available for the calculation of collision amplitudes and those used in practice for the calculation of the properties of composite systems or "bound states," especially in the case of a gauge theory such as QED. As an example, consider the scattering of two particles, "1" and "2",

$$1 + 2 \to 1 + 2, \tag{6}$$

with initial and final four-momenta p_1, p_2 and p_1', p_2', respectively. In a Lorentz-invariant theory the transition amplitude has the form $t_{fi} = N_f M N_i$, where $N_f = (4E_1' E_2')^{-1/2}$ and $N_i = (4E_1 E_2)^{-1/2}$ are the usual kinematic factors, and

$$M = M(s,t) \qquad [s \equiv P^2, t = Q^2] \tag{7}$$

is the invariant Feynman amplitude, with s and t the invariant squares of the total four-momentum $P = p_1 + p_2$ and four-momentum transfer $Q = p_1 - p_1'$. Let us first consider the effects arising from one-photon exchange between two distinct point-like spin-1/2 particles, such as an e^- and a μ^+.

2.1 Two spin-1/2 particles

Using Feynman gauge for the photon propagator one finds that the lowest-order contribution to M, regarded as a power series in e_1e_2, is given by

$$M^{(2)} = \bar{u}_1'\bar{u}_2' F^{(2)} u_1 u_2 \tag{8}$$

with the u_i denoting lepton spinors normalized to $2m_i$ and

$$F^{(2)} = e_1e_2\gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2/t. \tag{9}$$

In the c.m. system, $Q \to (0, \mathbf{q})$, with $\mathbf{q}$ the three-momentum transfer, $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}'$. On taking the Fourier transform of $F^{(2)}_{cm}$ with a factor $exp(-i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r})$, one sees that the corresponding transition amplitude $t^{(2)}$ can be obtained by taking the matrix element between plane wave spinors of the operator

$$U_{CG}(1,2) = k_{12}(1 - \alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2)/\mathrm{r} = \mathrm{U_C}(1,2) + \mathrm{U_G}(1,2) \tag{10}$$

with $U_G \equiv -k_{12}(\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2/\mathrm{r})$, the so-called Gaunt potential [3].

It is therefore tempting to say that, to leading order in e_1e_2, but regardless of the relative speed, the effective interaction between, "1" and "2" is given by (10). However, suppose that instead one uses the Coulomb gauge for the photon propagator. Then one finds that (9) is replaced by

$$F^{(2)}_T = e_1e_2[\gamma_1^0\gamma_2^0/Q^2 + (\gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2 - \gamma_1 \cdot Q\gamma_2 \cdot Q/Q^2)/Q^2]. \tag{11}$$

Fourier transformation of $F^{(2)}_{T;cm}$ yields

$$U_{CB}(1,2) = U_C + U_B, \tag{12}$$

where U_B is the operator

$$U_B = -k_{12}(\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2 + \alpha_1\hat{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \alpha_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})/2\mathrm{r} \tag{13}$$

originally obtained by Breit in the context of a bound state problem, as mentioned above. By construction, the Coulomb-Gaunt potential U_{CG} and the Coulomb-Breit potential U_{CB} have the same matrix element between product plane wave spinors, provided these are on the energy shell ($\mathbf{p}^2 = \mathbf{p}'^2$), a minimal requirement for an effective potential. Thus even in the simplest circumstances, asking for "the effective electron-electron potential" is too naive.

More serious is the fact that neither U_{CB} or U_{CG} are permissible approximations to an effective potential, in the context of a Dirac-spinor description of spin-1/2 particle wave functions. This can be most easily seen by including a third particle "3". The use of a sum such as $U(1,2) + U(1,3) + U(2,3)$ to describe the interaction is disastrous from the start, because of the problem of continuum dissolution [4,5]. Analysis shows that a theoretically well-founded choice for the

second-order potential is neither U_{CG} nor U_{CB}, but either of the two operators V_{CG} or V_{CB}, defined by

$$V_{CG} = \Lambda_{++} U_{CG} \Lambda_{++}, \quad V_{CB} = \Lambda_{++} U_{CB} \Lambda_{++}, \tag{14}$$

where $\Lambda_{++} = \Lambda_+(1)\Lambda_+(2)$ is the product of positive-energy Casimir-type projection operators for the leptons [5,6]. Since the spinors in (8) are eigenfunctions of the $\Lambda_+(i)$, these operators also reproduce the lowest-order amplitude.

All this is by now fairly well known. But a related question has received relatively little attention: What is an effective potential which describes the scattering amplitude correctly to fourth order? Before considering this, it is useful to study two simpler but instructive cases: two spin-0 particles, in scalar QED, and a spin-1/2 and a spin-0 particle, in spinor-scalar QED.

2.2 Two spin-0 particles

On using Feynman gauge to write down the one-photon exchange amplitude, one gets

$$M^{(2)} = e_1 e_2 (p_1 + p_1') \cdot (p_2 + p_2')/t = e_1 e_2 (2a + t)/t, \tag{15}$$

where $a = s - m_1^2 - m_2^2$. Fourier transformation of the c.m.value of (2.10) yields a term proportional to U_C, with an energy-dependent coefficient, plus a contact term proportional to $\delta(\mathbf{r})$. Such a potential is not suitable for use in a Schrödinger type of equation. In second-order perturbation theory it would lead to an ultraviolet (UV) divergence. A potential which is iterable can be obtained by first writing $M^{(2)}$ in a different form (which does not change its value on the mass shell) and then finding an equivalent operator in r-space, now involving derivative operators [7]. One is thereby led to what can be termed a Feynman-gauge-inspired (FGI) potential $V_{1\gamma}^{FGI}$, which in the c.m. system ($\mathbf{p}_1^{\rm op} \to \mathbf{p}_{\rm op}, \mathbf{p}_2^{\rm op} \to -\mathbf{p}_{\rm op}$) is

$$V_{1\gamma}^{FGI} = z'_{op} U_C z'_{op} + y_{op} (\mathbf{p}_{\rm op} {\rm U_C} \mathbf{p}_{\rm op}/2{\rm m_A m_B}) {\rm y_{op}}, \tag{16}$$

with $z'_{op} \equiv (1 + \mathbf{p}_{\rm op}^2/2{\rm E}_1^{\rm op}{\rm E}_2^{\rm op})^{1/2}$ and $y_p = (m_1 m_2/E_1^{op} E_2^{op})^{1/2}$. The corresponding Coulomb-gauge inspired (CGI) one-photon exchange potential $V_{1\gamma}^{CGI}$ is given by [8],

$$V_{1\gamma}^{CGI} = V_C + V_T \tag{17}$$

where, with a curly bracket denoting an anticommutator,

$$V_C = y_{op} [\{E_1^{op}, \{E_2^{op}, U_C\}\}] y_{op}/4 m_1 m_2 \tag{18}$$

is a relativistic version of the Coulomb interaction and

$$V_T = -(1/2) y_{op} \{\mathbf{p}_{1;{\rm i}}^{\rm op}, \{\mathbf{p}_{2;{\rm j}}^{\rm op}, (\delta_{\rm ij} + \hat{\rm r}_{\rm i}\hat{\rm r}_{\rm j}){\rm U_C}\}\}]{\rm y_{op}}/4{\rm m_1 m_2} \tag{19}$$

is the potential arising from the exchange of a transverse photon.

2.3 One-photon exchange potential in spinor-scalar QED

To complete the one-photon story, consider the exchange of a photon when "1" has spin-0 and "2" has spin-1/2. The Feynman amplitude is then given by

$$M^{(2)} = -e_1 e_2 \bar{u} \not{r} \gamma_2 \cdot (p_1 + p_1')u/t \tag{20}$$

The corresponding FGI potential is [9]

$$V_{1\gamma}^{FGI} = y_1^{op} \Lambda_+^{op}(2) U^{(2)} \Lambda_+^{op}(2) y_1^{op} \quad [y_1^{op} \equiv (m_1/E_1^{op})^{1/2}] \tag{21}$$

where

$$U^{(2)} = (E_1^{op} U_C + U_C^{op} E_1^{op} - \alpha \cdot \mathbf{p}_{\rm op} \mathrm{U_C} - \mathrm{U_C} \alpha \cdot \mathbf{p}_{\rm op})/2\mathrm{m}_1. \tag{22}$$

This is an analogue of $V_{1\gamma}^{FGI}$ for two spin-1/2 particles. There is a corresponding CGI potential which I do not write down. Use will be made of (21) in Sec. III.

2.4 Remarks on the orbit-orbit interaction

The difference between the two choices, $V_{1\gamma}^{FGI}$ and $V_{1\gamma}^{CGI}$ is connected with the form of the so-called orbit-orbit interaction. To see this, note that in the n.r. limit (16) yields as the leading correction to U_C an orbit-orbit interaction U_{o-o} of the form

$$U_{o-o}^{FGI} = \{\mathbf{p}_{\rm i}^{\rm op}, \{\mathbf{p}_{\rm j}^{\rm op}, \delta_{\rm ij} \mathrm{U_C}\}\}/4\mathrm{m_A m_B}, \tag{23}$$

whereas (17) yields

$$U_{o-o}^{CGI} = (1/2)\{\mathbf{p}_{\rm i}^{\rm op}, \{\mathbf{p}_{\rm j}^{\rm op}, (\delta_{\rm ij} + \hat{\rm r}_{\rm i}\hat{\rm r}_{\rm j})\mathrm{U_C}\}\}/4\mathrm{m_A m_B}. \tag{24}$$

Note that (24) is a manifestly hermitian form of the orbit-orbit interaction familiar from atomic physics, usually described in texts as resulting from the reduction of the Breit operator (13) to n.r. form. This is unfortunate from a pedagogical point of view, since the Breit operator refers only to spin-1/2 particles. Spin has nothing to do with it! I will return to the difference between (23) and (24) shortly.

3 Scattering potentials: Two-photon exchange

A key point in the definition of any potential, often overlooked, is that one must specify in advance how it is to be used. Let us work in the c.m. system of the particles, scattering with total energy E. With $h_0 = h_0(1) + h_0(2)$ the free Hamiltonian for the particles, we will require that the transition amplitude computed from

$$T_{op}(E) = V_{eff} + V_{eff}(E - h_0 - V_{eff} + i\epsilon)^{-1} V_{eff} \tag{25}$$

reproduce the scattering amplitude obtained from field theory to a given accuracy. I consider first the case of two spin-0 particles, then the mixed case of a spin-0 and a spin-1 particle, and finally the case of two spin-1/2 particles.

3.1 Two spin-0 particles

In scalar QED there are five Feynman diagrams corresponding to two-photon exchange, which contribute to the fourth-order amplitude $M^{(4)}$: the two-rung ladder (or "box") graph, and the two-rung crossed-ladder graph, a pair of "single-seagull" graphs, and a "double-seagull" graph. The sea-gull graphs are ultraviolet (UV) divergent, but these divergences are taken care of by renormalization and do not affect the long-distance behavior. More serious is the fact that the "box" and "crossed box" graphs are infrared (IR) divergent. Thus it seems at first sight that one cannot even begin to talk about a two-photon exchange potential!

The resolution of the IR problem lies in the recognition that the iteration amplitude M_I arising from $V_{1\gamma}$ is now also infrared divergent. This divergence is just the field-theoretic counterpart of the fact that in NRQM the second (and higher) Born approximations to the scattering of a charged particle in a Coulomb field is divergent (for any value of the momentum transfer). It turns out that the difference $M_{2\gamma} - M_I$ is IR convergent, so that the associated potential $V_{2\gamma}$ is well-defined after all.

I will only state the form of the result at large r (that is, r large compared to the Compton wave length of either particle) and at low momenta. On using $V_{1\gamma}^{FGI}$ to compute M_I one finds that [7],

$$V_{2\gamma}^{FGI} = c_2^{FGI} r^{-2} + c_3^{FGI} r^{-3} + ... \tag{26}$$

where, with $k \equiv e_1 e_2/4\pi$,

$$c_2^{FGI} = k^2/2(m_1 + m_2), \qquad c_3^{FGI} = -7k^2/6\pi m_1 m_2. \tag{27}$$

In contrast, use of $V_{1\gamma}^{CGI}$ yields [8]

$$V_{2\gamma}^{CGI} = c_2^{CGI} r^{-2} + c_3^{CGI} r^{-3} + ... \tag{28}$$

where

$$c_2^{CGI} = 0, \qquad c_3^{CGI} = -7k^2/6\pi m_1 m_2. \tag{29}$$

The difference between the asymptotic forms (25) and (28) can be traced back the difference in the associated forms of the orbit-orbit interactions mentioned above. Thus we see that in the case of two charged particles the leading asymptotic behavior of $V_{2\gamma}$ depends on the precise definition of $V_{1\gamma}$. This observation resolves a long-standing puzzle concerning conflicting results for the value of c_2. Further, as was noted some time ago by L. Spruch, c_2^{FGI} is classical in character, i.e. if h and c are restored, c_2 turns out to be independent of h . One should therefore try to understand the source of this term from classical electrodynamics. It turns out that this is indeed possible by a reexamination of the work of Darwin [1], but I will not enter into the details here [10].

3.2 A spin-1/2 and a spin-0 particle

A similar analysis can be carried out for the mixed case. If one uses $V_{1\gamma}^{FGI}$ to compute the iteration amplitude one finds that the spin- independent part of $V_{2\gamma}$ is

$$V_{2\gamma}^{s.i.} = k^2[2(m_1 + m_2)]^{-1} r^{-2}, \tag{30}$$

at large r and low energies, which coincides with that for two spin-zero particles. The spin-dependent part is essentially a spin-other-orbit type of interaction [9]

$$V_{2\gamma}^{s.o.} = -(e_1 e_2/4\pi)^2(\sigma \cdot \ell/4m_2^2)[(3m_1 + 5m_2)/m_1(m_1 + m_2)]r^{-4} \tag{31}$$

The two-photon-exchange spin-orbit interaction therefore decreases as r^{-4}, or one power more rapidly than that arising from one-photon exchange. Applications of this result to a variety of exotic systems, such as pionium and muonic helium, are considered in Ref. [9].

3.3 Two spin-1/2 particles

The computation of $V_{2\gamma}$ for two spin-1/2 particles, even of its asymptotic form for large r, turns out to be remarkably complex and has not yet been completed. However, some aspects are known and others can be guessed. For example, one can show that if $V_{1\gamma}^{FGI}$ is used for the lowest-order potential, then the spin-independent part of $V_{2\gamma}$ coincides, for large r , with that for two spin-0 particles and the spin-other-orbit part coincides with that for a spin-0 particle "1" and a spin-1/2 particle "2", plus a similar term with "1" and "2" interchanged. At large r and low energies one expects that the spin-spin part $V_{2\gamma}^{s-s}$ has the form

$$V_{2\gamma}^{s-s} = k^2[A(r)\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 + \mathrm{B(r)}\sigma_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}\sigma_{\mathbf{1}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathbf{2}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}], \tag{32}$$

with $A(r) = ar^{-p}$ and $B(r) = br^{-q}$. The coefficients a and b , and the exponents p and q , remain to be determined. For equal-mass particles, such as two electrons, $a = a'/m^{p-1}$ where a' is dimensionless and likely to be of order unity. To guess the value of p , note that in the large r , low-energy limit the spin-spin part coming from $V_{1\gamma}$ has one more inverse power of r than the spin- other-orbit part. If the same relation holds for two-photon exchange, then $p = 5$.

4 Scattering potentials and bound states

Let us now consider the possible relevance of all this to the computation of relativistic atomic structure, one of Ingvar Lindgren's keen interests.

The application of QED to compute such structure to an accuracy beyond order $\alpha^2 Ry$, for systems more complicated than the classic two-body systems (hydrogen, positronium, and muonium) began in the mid-fifties, with calculations of the fine structure of helium to an accuracy of order $\alpha^3 Ry$ [11,12]. These calculations, and subsequent ones of spin-dependent effects of order $\alpha^4 Ry$ [13], were based on a generalization of the two-body Bethe-Salpeter (BS) equation to include an external field. The generalized BS equation leads in a somewhat convoluted way to an equation of the form

$$H_{++}\Psi = E\Psi \tag{33}$$

where

$$H_{++} = h_D^{ext}(1) + h_D^{ext}(2) + L_{++}U_C(1,2)L_{++}, \tag{34}$$

with $h_D^{ext}(i) = \alpha_{\mathrm{i}} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{\mathrm{i}} + \beta_{\mathrm{i}}\mathrm{m} - \mathrm{Z}\alpha/\mathrm{r_i}$ the usual external-field Dirac Hamiltonian and L_{++} the product of the associated external-field positive-energy projection operators. This equation, called the

(external-field) no-pair Coulomb-ladder equation in [12], can be used as the starting point of a systematic perturbative approach to the energy levels of He and He-like systems. The corresponding equation with U_C replaced by $U_C + U_B$ contains not only all $\alpha^2 Ry$ corrections to fine-structure, but a number of corrections of order $\alpha^3 Ry$ as well. (For large Z these can be expressed in analytic form. Recently, Lindgren and his collaborators [14] have developed methods for solving such equations numerically with sufficient accuracy to enable them to verify the analytic results.)

However, the further calculations needed to obtain the remaining $\alpha^3 Ry$ and still higher-order corrections, such as those coming from two-photon exchange, are complicated, messy, and have all the appeal of a thorny, black box. They contrast strongly with the beauty of scattering-amplitude calculations, where among other things one can advantageously use a covariant propagator for the photon. It is an attractive idea to try to understand what part of the level structure can be thought of as arising purely from those forces which act when the electrons undergo free scattering. To put it another way, note that in NRQM one can describe both the scattering of two electrons and their interaction within a bound state with one and the same interaction potential U_C. The question then is to what extent one can, within the framework of QED, understand the bound states in terms of the same two-body effective potentials which describe the scattering accurately. It is clear that in QED there are effects which cannot be so described, *e.g.* the effects of the external potential provided by the nucleus during the exchange of photons between the electrons.

The availability of a lepton-lepton potential which reproduces the scattering amplitude exactly to order $(e_1 e_2)^2$ would be a significant step in the direction of such a goal [15]. An early test of such a program would be provided, for example, by solution the "free no-pair ladder equation" [5]

$$h_{++}\Psi = E\Psi \tag{35}$$

where

$$h_{++} = h_+^{ext}(1) + h_+^{ext}(2) + V_{++}. \tag{36}$$

Here $h_+^{ext}(i) = \alpha_{\rm i} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{\rm i} + \beta_{\rm i} {\rm m} + \Lambda_+({\rm i})(-{\rm Z}\alpha/{\rm r_i})\Lambda_+({\rm i})$, and V_{++} is of the form $V_{++} = \Lambda_{++} U(1,2) \Lambda_{++}$, with Λ_{++} the product of free positive-energy projection operators, as in (14). The operator $U(1,2) = U^{(2)} + U^{(4)}$ must be chosen so that if the external potential is turned off, the one-photon and two-photon exchange scattering amplitudes are reproduced. (I note in passing that if one uses $U^{(2)} = U_{CG}$ rather that U_{CB} one must already include $U^{(4)}$ to get the correct $\alpha^2 Ry$ level shift!) On comparing the eigenvalues of (35) with those obtained from, e.g., the Bethe-Salpeter equation approach, one could disentangle those dynamical effects involved in the scattering from those which are peculiar to the bound-state situation. For Z not too large one would have an initial description in the language of configuration space which is not only quite accurate, but which also could actually be explained to students, without requiring that they become experts in the arcana of four-dimensional wave equations and all that. So it may well appeal to Ingvar Lindgren: As the photo-op at the end of this symposium showed, the results of his pedagogical skill and devotion could only be captured by a wide-angle lens!

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation.

References

1. C.E. Darwin, Philos. Mag. **39** , 537 (1920).
2. G. Breit, Phys. Rev. **34** , 553 (1929).
3. J.B. Gaunt, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **122** , 513 (1929).
4. G. Brown and D.G Ravenhall, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **208** , 552 (1951).
5. J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. A **25** , 348 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. **55** , 1023 (1985).
6. For a review, see e.g. J. Sucher, in Program on Relativistic, Quantum Electrodynamic and Weak Interaction Effects in Atoms, edited by W.R. Johnson, P. Mohr, and J. Sucher (AIP, New York, 1989).
7. G. Feinberg and J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. D **38** , 3763 (1988).
8. J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. D **49** , 4284 (1994).
9. G. Feinberg and J. Sucher. Phys. Rev. D **45** , 2493 (1992).
10. J. Sucher, Comm. At. Mol. Phys. **30** , 129 (1994).
11. H. Araki, Prog. Theoret. Phys. **17** , 6191 (1957).
12. J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. **109** , 1010 (1958).
13. M.H. Douglas and N.M. Kroll, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **82** , 89 (1974)
14. I. Lindgren et al., Phys. Rev. **A51** , 1167 (1995).
15. There is an additional force between leptons, arising from the exchange of a neutrino-antineutrino pair, which is unfortunately too weak to be accessible experimentally. For a review, see J. Sucher, in *Proceedings of the XIVth Moriond Workshop: Particle Astrophysics, Atomic Physics and Gravitation* , Villars-sur-Ollon, January, 1994.